DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 432 EC 006 130

TITLE	Special Education - Today and Tomorrow. Summary Report on the Regional Conference on Improvement of Education of Handicapped Children (Denver, Colorado, April 25-26, 1968).
INSTITUTION	Colorado State College, Greeley.
PUB DATE	Apr 68
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, Educational Planning, *Exceptional Child Education, *Handicapped Children, Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Problems raised and solutions proposed at a conference on improvement of education for handicapped children are extensively listed under the following categories: preparation of personnel, developing leadership and coordination of programs, research, information dissemination, scope of special education, labeling, rural area services, terminal expectations, and evaluation of existing programs. Also included are the conference agenda, a roster of participants, and the text of a speech advocating the increased responsibility of colleges and universities for training of personnel and research. (KW)

ED041432

SUMMARY REPORT

REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

SPECIAL EDUCATION - TODAY AND TOMORROW

Hosted by

Colorado State College

Denver, Colorado

April 25-26, 1968

ED006130

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARY REPORT

Title: Special Education - Today and Tomorrow

Problem and Objectives:

The road to improved education for handicapped children has many turnings. The enactment of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with the establishment of a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education, the expansion of the media program for the handicapped, the development of deaf-blind centers, resource centers, and research centers, and the introduction of direct aid under Title I, Title III, and Title VI of ESEA, all may be considered significant strides down this long and difficult road.

Facilitating legislation is necessary but not sufficient to bring about the educational changes which will give handicapped pupils the opportunities in life to which all people are entitled. It takes people to implement programs and to find ways to make them work successfully. It takes the collaborative thinking of educators at all levels to develop new models, new goals, and new directions.

The problem which prompted this conference was the problem of special education. The problem of determining where we are now--today. The problem of determining where we must be if the handicapped are to share in the future of America--tomorrow. The problem of moving from point to point on the road to better programs for the handicapped.

The objective of the conference activity was to examine the pressing problems facing educators today and to search out possible solutions. To search out new ideas and to find new directions. To find out where we are today and to examine our goals for tomorrow. A major goal of the program was to bring unity to the efforts of individuals at all governmental levels and to establish common goals for the future. The specific objectives of the conference were:

1. To establish priorities and goals for programs relating to the education of handicapped children.
2. To develop an understanding of the nature of the problems relating to the education of the handicapped.
3. To examine current practice in the field of special education and reformulate (if necessary) goals and objectives.
4. To establish a framework of communication among the various organizations and institutions representing the field which will permit the field to best serve the needs of handicapped children.

Procedures:

The general procedure was to call together a select group of special educators for a two-day conference. Included with the group was a number of non-special educators as resource people.

1. Participants. - The number of participants was approximately 100. They were selected from State education agencies, universities, local education agencies, and from regional or national associations. Members of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped also attended the conference. The participants who were selected represented leaders in special education and the various settings mentioned above. The participants were selected from the following states: Missouri, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Colorado, and Utah. The resource people represented related disciplines.

2. Agenda. - The agenda was as follows:

Thursday, April 25, 1968

8:00 A.M. Registration

9:00 A.M. Welcome - Dr. Tony D. Vaughan
Chairman, Department of Special Education
Colorado State College

Challenge

Dr. James J. Gallagher, Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

10:00 A.M. Break

10:30 A.M. Small Group Discussions to Identify Significant Problems (Group and Room Assignments in Large Packet)

12:00 Noon Lunch

1:15 P.M. Continued Small Group Discussions

3:15 P.M. Growth and Development of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Dr. James J. Gallagher
Associate Commissioner
Chairman and Staff

4:30 P.M. Outline of Second Day and Announcements

Dr. Tony D. Vaughan
Conference Director

Friday, April 26, 1968

8:45 A.M. "A Working Partnership"

Dr. Darrell Holmes
President
Colorado State College

9:45 A.M. Break

10:15 A.M. Small Discussions to Examine Specific Approaches to the Solution of Specific Problems. (The role of Federal, State and Local agencies in the solution of such problems was examined. The identification of new tools for change will be one goal of these group discussions.)

12:00 Noon Lunch

1:15 P.M. Continuation of Small Group Discussions

3:00 P.M. Conference Summary - "Major Problems in Special Education"

Dr. B. R. Gearheart
Associate Professor, Special Education
Colorado State College

The questions and problems raised by the participants for consideration and the solutions proposed fell into the following broad categories (listed in general order of priority):

1. PREPARATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL.

   a. What are some promising recruitment methods?

   "Monitor" courses in CP - they are UCP sponsored - could be extended nationwide.

   Contact Future Teacher Clubs

   One area has a mentally retarded dance once a month and high school seniors chaperone (try to interest them in special education program).

   Could use Purdue's method of bringing in students for a week of classes and giving them heavy indoctrination of all exceptionalities.

   Need to indoctrinate high school counselors to the special education program.

   Use Media such as TV (have spots on stations other than the educ. network)
   Use Media such as Magazines - get articles into popular types for students (Seventeen, etc.)
   Use Media such as Films - New one on MR - Take that First Step - is a good one

   More money offered - extra salary steps or differential, for fully-endorsed teachers.

   Pick out a good enthusiastic teacher (rather than the administrative head, who is not always as excited about the program) to attend meetings, give talks, etc.

Recruit a well-known figure that young people identify with, to talk to groups or commencements and build up special education program.

We must make sure public image of special education is good enough to entice new teachers.

Housing for special classes must be adequate so that they aren't moved around to make room for "normal" classes.

Better public relations to make area more of a challenge and more glamorous.

Greater support and involvement of "Teens Aids to the Retarded" - "Youth NARC" in the program.

Earlier exposure or contact with the exceptional child is the key to better recruitment. This contact may be achieved through part-time work, summer campus, group projects, etc. The contact should be more extensive each year in college.

Individuals who drop from college to be married or for financial reasons and junior college students and graduates can be very good teacher's aides, day school personnel, etc.

Establish volunteer programs involving high school and undergraduate college students to give them exposure to exceptional children.

Attempt to implement a program to work with exceptional children much like the Peace Corps, VISTA, "Teach Corps", etc.

Personal attention by special education college faculty should be given the individual student. Because of our smaller numbers compared to the general education program, we have the opportunity to get closer to the individual student.

Get information about special education down to the high school level through counselors, "career days," school service organizations, etc.

With the assistance of high school counselors, identify and bring together interested graduating high school seniors into summer institutes which would operate to explore the opportunities of special education for such students. (3 to 4 day institute)

Work for an introductory survey class to be required of all general education students and make this course of outstanding caliber.

Have national office develop handouts and other recruitment literature which can be disseminated locally.

Greater emphasis should be made toward assisting youngsters interested in special education to obtain summer and part time work in the field of special education or related community and service programs.

Keep undergrads who are interested busy by doing volunteer work with exceptional children. Could be used as tutor, discussion leaders, ward or teacher aides.

The resources of the public high school should be tapped by means of service to handicapped children, babysitting with the handicapped, religion classes for the handicapped, etc.

The CEC bulletin, "Careers in Special Education" should be made available to high school students who are interested in college.

Students entering college must be shown the facilities which the college has to offer. If good programs are available and there is a bright outlook for employment, the student will be drawn toward special education.

We ought to look for new resources to gain staff for schools of special education. Maybe everyone need not be college educated with special certification.

It was suggested that there be a direct confrontation on the national level between the American Guidance Association and CEC to develop a program which will improve the H. S. Counselor's knowledge and understanding of special education.

b. <u>How can we more effectively screen Special Education personnel</u>?

Students should have their student teaching under a master teacher. The master teacher could then make her recommendations about the student.

Some felt GRE's not particularly good criteria.

Need tests more of empathy (not sympathy).

Tests should evaluate (a) past experiences (b) personality (c) attitudes, and others.

Need research on how teachers "got into" special education.

Need for counseling for undergraduate students which instructors feel should not be in program. Perhaps sent to psychological services for counseling.

Suggest Bureau do research on specific subjective techniques - could they set guidelines?

Could have regular screening during career, as levels of certification through the years (end of 3 yrs., 5 yrs., etc.)

Definitely need more nationwide agreement of screening and certification.

Have the national or state special education departments develop guidelines for effective local in-service training programs.

Identify those personality characteristics and prior experiences which lead college students to become interested in special education.

To effectively screen personnel we should be more concerned with (1) drive, (2) interest, (3) energy, and (4) motivation. Transcripts and student-teaching evaluations are not satisfactory criteria for screening special education personnel.

Earlier contact by university staff, during training period, for earlier evaluation and screening.

Greater attention to remediate problems.

Five criteria suggested were:

1. Review panel of professors
2. G.P.A. at least C+.
3. Autobiographic sketches.
4. Appropriate psychological testing.
5. Effective and continuing counseling.

By utilizing performance on core requirement courses plus adviser observation, a better evaluation could be made.

Frequent exposure to all types of activities of the handicapped at an early time in the student's program, can be a self-screening technique.

Attempt to get critique teachers to be more frank in their evaluation of the student teacher throughout his experience.

Encourage research to develop an instrument to evaluate certain qualities that seem to be common to good special education teachers--this would be used as a guide and not an "screening out" device.

Have college student experience practicum with special education as soon as is possible in his college life. Screen out those not fitted. Encourage strong candidates.

A self screening program established in the training institutes would be as effective as any screening method.

c. <u>How may we improve relations between Special Education and General Education</u>?

Too many students (teachers later) isolate themselves from other programs and the community (this comes from being isolated during their college training).

Work toward giving the special education teacher an image of being a regular school employee

Encourage special educators to be active in many professional organizations.

Regarding Special Education and General Education relations, the committee agreed that this is a "give and take" situation.

We need to give much more support to general education.

Overview course required of all prospective teachers.

More interplay between the two departments by use of counseling cooperatives.

Better communications between all areas of education.

Special educators should play down the favored position of special education. Utilize public relations techniques to better acquaint all areas with special education.

Requiring courses in other disciplines.

Relaxing required courses so that more courses in other areas could be encouraged -- this would require changes in certification requirements and especially in hiring practices of districts, particularly large districts.

Having people with broader backgrounds teach the general type courses so that their teaching of these courses would not be so slanted by their background.

Inservice training for regular education teachers would help bridge gaps.

Urge that the small college (where education has prestige) be given support Federally to develop and expand special education programs.

Include regular educators in all institutes held by Special Education.

2. DEVELOPING BETTER LEADERSHIP, SUPERVISION AND COORDINATION.

a. How can the Federal government better serve this need?

Some federal funding has gotten to special education programs at the local level that didn't meet state standards. When this happens, the state's financial lever is weakened, and they have difficulty enforcing standards.

Some leadership at the federal level needs to be exerted in assisting states evaluate the merits of permissive and mandatory legislation.

Government could support clearing house activities for personnel.

Would it be possible to examine the feasibility of providing some form of grant aid to individuals who cannot afford to relinquish their job to become a full time student, but could attend school on a half-day or part-time basis? In effect, extending the length of the grant using some form of quarter hour or semester hour proration to determine grant support for schooling currently being taken.

Examine the feasibility of regional special education offices run by the federal bureau. These offices could house consultants who could work closely with state department special education personnel.

Continuation of regional meetings sponsored by the federal bureau such as the one in which we are currently participating.

The federal bureau should disseminate the information accumulated in these regional meetings, particularly as it relates to the priorities they will follow in the coming few years. This will provide direction to the local special education program, college training programs, and to the individual doing research.

State department personnel need more federal direction and explicit information as new laws and programs evolve, so that they can in turn effectively communicate with local leaders.

Training institutions should use part of their support money for self-evaluation. We need more state evaluation because we have consistently failed to evaluate ourselves.

The Bureau should conduct more regional conferences to advise and instruct us in this area.

P.L. 88-164 money should not be so restricted in its uses.

Line of communication between the government offices and the state and local offices must be improved.

(a) In area of grants there should be a verbal planning approach rather than an application (written) approach. In evaluation step, applicant should receive specifics relating to grant program proposals from evaluating committee. Committee should have as diversified an evaluation group as possible. (Broader involvement of community resources.)

Fragmentation and duplication is a problem. Need organization that will define the issues. This should be a central agency which will disseminate issues and considerations relating to these issues.

Lack of unified approach to problems by lay and professional groups. Through Bureau, state, and districts, greater professional assistance should be given lay and other professional groups. The objectives should be to strengthen and unify leadership and its objectives.

Appropriate comprehensive planning must precede the proper utilization of Title funds. Bureau of the Handicapped must take initiative to promote long range planning at state level. Administrators need management counsel in planning for long range efforts. Again we must utilize the professionals who can help us, e.g. military and business leaders.

Comprehensive planning is good but can become a straitjacket, so must be flexible.

Comprehensive planning must be joint effort - colleges and state departments and other components must play a role in the planning.

Other titles and grants or government aids must be considered in long range planning so that overlapping is kept at a minimum.

b. <u>What about the role of State departments of education</u>?

Is there a need for closer supervision by special education state department in school building design?

Need to consider the trend that strengthens the State Dept. to the destruction of the local district autonomy. (Group felt you have to bow to State Dept. man in their area to get some of the money allotted for their district, especially now that State Dept. can take a great deal of the money allotted and disperse it how they want.)

Most state special education departments need more and better consultants.

State diagnostic facilities and teams need to be established. In some states they may want to take the form of traveling teams who could diagnose and consult.

Certification requirements for individuals holding these positions are poor. Certification requirements should be improved.

Leadership comes from the State Department. This office should be strengthened to provide the kind of leadership needed.

c. <u>What organizational model will promote better coordination with other agencies</u>?

Can master teachers be utilized to supervise several teacher aides in trainable programs?

Many state and local special education programs have poor visability, particularly at budget time, because of their organizational placement in the power structure.

How can we maintain purpose and motivation among personnel in positions of leadership?

How can we internally coordinate different special education programs at the state level so that they don't re-duplicate each other's service?

Could perhaps have regional meetings for relocation (swapping) of personnel. Could be general or could be in areas of exceptionalities. Some people probably would like to move and try another area (theirs may be too big or too small).

Need some common ground or model stressing how we are alike rather than our differences being stressed, which seems to be pulling us away all the time.

To promote a closer working relationship between the University and Public Schools - would be good to have university personnel change places with the teacher - each could see the other's problems and ways of working them out, rather than being isolated from each other.

State wide planning for early identification.

Attempt to place special education on an equal status organizationally with general elementary education and secondary education.

To improve leadership, supervision, and coordination the training programs must be improved. Too many college graduates have too little training in these areas.

Streamline State Dept. of Education through federal grants and state support. Money given to districts without the State Dept. being able to supply adequate leadership, coordination, etc., is not good procedure.

3. RESEARCH

a. What are the more basic research needs in Special Education?

There is a need for coordination of research effort - should be a clearing house not only for information but actual research and implementation.

Are we actually presenting what we should to our classes? Is our curriculum adequate? Are there better ways?

Who should do the diagnosis and follow-up of children? Psychologist? Or perhaps a trained 5-year educator?

Should the TMR and EMR be a 9, 10, or 12-month program?

How do we get systematic educational training started from developmental stages on? How can we create an awareness of this need for handicapped and normal?

In terms of research the three most basic questions are:

1. WHO are these children we talk about?
2. WHERE are these youngsters?
3. WHAT are we going to do about these children?

It was agreed that better and more extensive research surveys and studies are the answers to questions 1 and 2. The third question should be investigated by Bureau funded projects to determine exactly what can be done regarding more effective techniques, materials, and approaches.

Research related to screening personnel should be undertaken.

b. How may we better approach these needs?

Independently academically oriented individual will never accomplish much.

Active involvement.

Demonstration Centers.

Some could use completed studies and re-do them, or follow-up some recommendations that were made in studies. Just as valuable sometimes to go on as start new research endeavor.

Could use Bureau ideas for research when in your own area of interest.

Strengthening of the State Department so that it can give greater leadership to the district in the area of research would help to reduce many of the problems in this area.

A National Research Lab should be established for both applied and basic research.

c. How do we attack the problem of the inability of many, at the "grass-roots" level, to understand and apply research?

Should come from some concerted effort in some areas to do the research and then involve people so that they understand research and by being involved will use the research.

Better training of teachers in the classroom. Get to the students who are graduating as new teachers. So they can interpret what they read and use it. Writing should be down to earth, so people can read and understand.

Have conferences that "boil down" research as teachers don't read all that is published. Could be reviews of recent research.

A master-teacher plan was agreed by the committee to be a good way of applying this research at the "grass-roots" level. Periodically, classroom teachers would assemble and via T.V. would watch master-teacher demonstrations of effective techniques, materials, and approaches.

Strengthening of the State Department so that it can give greater leadership to the district in the area of research would help to reduce many of the problems in this area.

4. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

a. How can IMC's be made more effective?

How can grant applications be refined and simplified?

IMC's are doing a good job for such a new organizational setup.

The IMC's should be more than a warehouse of materials; they should have the staff and means of finance to evaluate and develop new materials. They should be able to effectively and efficiently field test materials.

The IMC should also be an in-service training agency.

IMC effectiveness depends on the field personnel, more needed to be trained and placed on these jobs.

Better communication with all teachers.

Make service available to all teachers.

By using more mobile units.

By demonstrating the use of their tools.

By being resource and consultive personnel.

The group was enthusiastic about the IMC concept but it was obvious that it was working out better in some areas than others.

IMC should continue to develop methods and approaches now in effect so that remoter areas will be fully served. These include--

use of satellite centers
mobile units
demonstration teachers
teachers sharing materials through IMC
building materials to meet needs
teachers evaluating materials used

Caption audio visual materials may prove as effective in other areas of Special Education as they have in deaf education, therefore should be made available to all areas of handicapped children through the IMCs.

Develop the function of evaluating and helping teachers in practical application of research results.

IMCs should be utilized as follow-up agencies: They should have personnel who can stay with a teacher for a period of time to insure that she can implement recommendations and use the developed techniques.

IMCs should have personnel who can interpret diagnostic information for the local teacher and be able to show her how to implement these recommendations.

b. <u>How can Federal Agencies better communicate with State and Local agencies</u>?

Can reporting to the federal bureau be systematized between the different states? For example, do varying prevalence rates exist between the states, or are they a reflection of different criteria?

Government personnel needs to be more actively involved in programs and problems of the districts and not <u>have</u> to go through state departments.

Bureau should keep field informed as to "What is New?"

The Bureau should be enlarged and be able to provide more consultative services.

Upgrade courtesy communication techniques.

Provide better definition of roles of the agency and realize that communication is not terminal, but that rather a continuum exists from local to federal.

By providing for more demonstration projects and moving them around.

By providing more consultive service to state agencies.

Published directory for all agencies would be very helpful. Even if names are not listed, positions and responsibilities can be.

c. What is the role of State agencies? How could they become more effective?

How can we communicate the needs and building requirements of the physically handicapped to architects designing schools and other public facilities?

State agencies should make sure they are taking care of all the needs of the state and not just certain districts (or their friends).

The IMC's role should be expanded and become more and more a responsibility of the state.

State agencies need:

1. More Money
2. Better personnel
3. More stature
4. More acceptance of state level leadership.

The feeling was that if these needs could be met, state agencies would achieve maximum effectiveness. Further, that until such changes are made they will remain rather ineffectual.

By hiring better personnel - paying larger salaries to get them.

By hiring more consultive people and itinerant personnel.

All should be preparing now for discontinuance of federal funding so that there should be no falling off in services due to inadequate advanced budgetry planning.

5. SCOPE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

a. Early childhood education - is it our responsibility?

Yes, our responsibility.

There should be systematic educational training from developmental stages on.

Should definitely have pre-school classes.

State legislation needs to be enacted to allow special education programs to meet the needs of very young handicapped children. The federal bureau might take steps in facilitating the enactment of such legislation through advisement, etc.

Identification programs must become more effective and uniform between states.

Communication with medical people must be encouraged so that they can do a more effective job of early parent counseling.

More utilization of special education services by Head Start.

Lower the age of children that the schools can serve to 2 or 3 years.

More cooperation and coordination of services between agencies and disciplines.

Support money from federal government to encourage research to demonstrate the value of this type of service.

State legislation needs to allow for early childhood education and also for extended education. Educators should press for legislation that allows inclusion of children up to age of 21 with no lower limit.

Identification of handicapped infants: A national effort is needed here. Educators need to work closer with the medical profession to develop such procedures as:

Hearing assessment of new born babies in hospital
Well Baby clinics - especially in disadvantaged areas.
Diagnostic Clinics - with satellite centers and even mobile clinics in some areas where distances are great and population sparse.

In all cases community follow up should be guaranteed and advantage must be taken of early identification with programs for the children and their parents.

Early education activities should be across the board in education, not just special education. It should not be special education problems alone but joint effort.

Special education must be involved in both prevention and treatment through early childhood education.

b. <u>Extended education - how far do we go</u>?

We should go as far as needed - including adult retardate.

Should always have an available facility.

We should adjust to the needs and provide them.

Wherever possible, special educators should be encouraged to work themselves out of a job by re-integrating special education youngsters who can successfully function in regular society.

More cooperation between Vocational Rehabilitation and the schools.

More job oriented school programs rather than modified academic ones.

More "efficient living" courses throughout the curriculum.

More utilization of the community and its people as a resource in better equipping the student for a job.

It seems unwise to expand present scope of special education unless we have met present manpower needs. Let's not expand so thin that we are not effective.

c. <u>TMR - whose responsibility?</u>

TMR - public schools responsibility. Needs to be a learning situation.

Trainable programs should attempt to achieve as wide an inter-agency base and concern as possible, although one central agency, such as the school will provide the leadership.

If the child meets certain criteria, set for his protection, he is the responsibility of the public schools - the schools could provide service for him by cooperating with other agencies or facilities and by attempting to upgrade them.

The terminology: profoundly and moderately should be used to distinguish those who should be the responsibility of institutions (i.e. profoundly) and those who are properly the responsibility of public special education (i.e. moderately).
Interest was expressed in provisions in Missouri where the State Special Education Dept. directly administers day schools throughout the state.

TMR is joint responsibility but leaning toward education.

d. <u>Minority (Indian, Spanish American, etc.). Where are we really going in this area?</u>

Should have special teachers for the language problem.

Need some special materials for these students to bring them up to other students.

Many places cannot have "track" system programs anymore so must provide for these students.

By providing service to all children, especially early childhood education, the problem would disappear.

More migrant programs for those that move frequently, to be designed to fit the needs of the locality.

Teachers that move with the migrant groups (hired by the federal government).

Keeping the children together and letting the parents move only--this would require a law change.

It was recognized that many Spanish-American children did not have the early background to succeed in public schools as at present constituted, hence many were in special classes for M.R. It was felt that they would be best taken out from under the M.R. label and included in Educationally Handicapped. In other words Sp. Ed. should broaden its scope to recognize transitory educational needs.

Special Education needs to get involved in joint responsibility with the Bureau of Indian affairs, etc. to effect change in education.

Must be involved in early childhood education of minority groups.

Local effort will never solve problems of local minority groups. Efforts must be on national level.

6. LABELING (categories)

Need to achieve agreement on the educational meaning of many terms currently in vogue that contain various implications.

Look at total child and treat the prime needs. These may cross categories and should not be limited by labels.

Labels should be abolished. Look at behavior and deal with it. We need to think of consequences in such a move, such as financing, etc. and develop a program which is child oriented rather than oriented toward administration, etc.

Teachers should receive broader training in special education. Total specialization can become a limiting factor which may jeopardize the child rather than be supportive of his needs.

We need to work with others and experiment with other types of programs. We need to look at training procedures which will help solve these problems.

Move in the direction of describing the child's level of functioning and away from handicapping conditions and areas of disfunction.

Program to the needs and strengths as opposed to inabilities.

More flexibility in state legislation is necessary to allow preferential placement--regardless of identification procedures or criteria. This would allow child to develop to his capacity on own level of expectancy for him.

State department guidelines need to be written in such a manner as to allow beneficial placement rather than placement to facilitate funding.

The problem is one of re-defining categories for special education rather than dropping labels.

Labels help define our efforts to the public. This includes our legislators. This fact must be considered before action which would lead to general aid to education, not categorical aid. If we cut off the labels, will we be also cutting off special funding, which is connected to labels?

Labels should be developed which represent an educational point of view, not medical or psychological. The Bureau could well fund such a massive project.

More general language in legislation for handicapped could be developed with specific labeling left to the discretion of the professional educator.

The U.S. office could well fund long term investigation on the terminology in Special Education. CEC might be a logical group.

7. <u>PROVIDING SERVICES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION CHILDREN IN SPARSELY POPULATED AREAS.</u>

How do we allocate funds to sparsely populated area's special education programs? According to ADA? Population distribution? Classroom unit? etc.

It is impossible to separate the variables of sparsity and economics.

Cooperative programs (or districts).

More consultive people and itinerant teachers in the state department to bring service to the outlying communities.

Affect more permissive legislation:
a. Allow state lines to be crossed to provide a population center or to bring students to the services.
b. Infiltrate parent pressure groups to offer them guidance.

Placement in a regional center and utilizing foster homes.

Help from the Bureau for the small colleges and outlying districts in the preparation of proposals that would meet criteria for funding.

Fast helicopter service.

Regional service center approach.

Multi-specialist working with teacher and children where needed. The Steamboat Springs program of Sanders was used as an example.

Central location of materials was emphasized with fast service and the ability to demonstrate these facilities and aids.

We need to attack the problem by employing the talents of other disciplines, such as sociologists. Maybe we should encourage families with handicapped to relocate where services are more available or where their child will fit better: e.g. agrarian atmosphere.

8. CLARIFICATION OF TERMINAL EXPECTATIONS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PUPILS.

How can we get college personnel in the field of special education to work closer with the public school special education program?

How can the new technology of closed circuit T.V., programmed learning etc. be feasibly and economically introduced into the battery of methods a special education teacher has at her disposal?

We need to develop a multi-discipline approach to teacher education programs and special education classrooms.

Post-school programs need to be given greater emphasis because some of our terminal expectancies will not be sufficiently high to allow the individual to enter unlimited competition as provided in a completely unsheltered life situation. Thus, sheltered workshops are desperately needed.

Greater emphasis should be placed on the encouragement of private agency workshops, etc. from which services could be purchased.

Curricular goals in all special education programs need to be continually reevaluated in behavioristic terms.

We tend to get from handicapped youngsters approximately what we expect from them; consequently we need to be on guard against underestimating their potential. When we estimate their potential too low, we produce the opportunity for turning out functionally retarded individuals.

9. EVALUATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.

Should evaluation of grant programs be internal or external?

How can we effectively communicate the failures as well as the successes that occur in our special education programs so that failures will be less likely to be repeated?

What can be done to more effectively evaluate the curricular material that is bombarding the market ostensibly for special education use? Could a central evaluation center be set up in the IMC network so that these centers won't reduplicate each others work?

How can we get teachers to implement the media and curricular materials they do acquire?

How do the recipients of our special education programs feel about the services they have received?

More emphasis should be placed in integrating evaluation procedures into each federal grant proposal.

How can an effective program for evaluating local district special education programs be achieved? Should this be external or internal?

Teams of special educators might be formed to serve as advisors and evaluators of local special education programs, much like some form of an accreditation bureau. This would provide greater direction and motivation to local special education programs.

What is written in projects and what is being done are frequently not the same. The development of sound evaluation procedures and reports which deal with concrete, meaningful aspects of the program and its effectiveness are necessary. This can be realized by strengthening the State Department through the staffing of specialized personnel who can assist districts in establishing sound evaluation techniques.

At the Bureau level model statutes should be developed and distributed which will emphasize the need for legislative flexibility and standardization, rather than rigidity which stifles development.

The following additional comments and questions were raised by the conference participants:

Void of trained special education administrators.

Insufficient methodology taught in college.

Colleges and Universities hire people who lack experience with kids.

More pre-school programs.

Enhancement of high school programs - job oriented.

More communication with the medical profession.

Too much duplication of service among agencies due to lack of communication.

We need to decide terminal behavior and establish programs accordingly.

Too much improper placement.

Can't get the knowledge needed to plan ahead.

Movement of teachers (changing jobs and localities).

Not enough inservice training.

Legislation is too restrictive.

The stigma of the disability among the public.

Colleges tend to add on rather than revise a program that isn't doing the job.

Many educators consider self over the child.

Practicum is too short.

Physical space.

Professional jealousy.

State departments are too politically oriented.

Difficult to use title monies because not enough to go around.

Relationships with parents.

More research needed and of a more practical nature.

Breaking tradition.

The most critical thing to know is how we may effectively develop a procedure to get new information and techniques to the classroom teacher.

There is a lack of communication and cooperation between special educators and administrators.

There is too little self-evaluation in special education. Both training institutions and public schools are lacking in this area.

Legislation is inadequate and inappropriate.

There is a lack of adequately trained personnel.

Certification standards are poor.

There is a lack of planning in all areas. We need better plans. We need to set up priorities.

Communication of Meaningful Information

1. How can we get a flow of meaningful information efficiently through the organizational maze.
   (a) Information about services available
   (b) Information about agencies
2. How do we get federal monies to the local teacher.
3. How do we resolve duplicating services.

What do we need to know about State Departments:

1. Are they doing their job?
2. Are they attempting the right job?
3. Do we need a State Dept. of Education?

Problem is what we need materials for; then we can decide on the materials.

Define Goals for SPED!
What are we going to teach?
What decides what we teach?
How can we reach these goals?

Problem is do we need more specialists or de we need to develop classroom teachers who can do many things.

How do we get "demonstators" into the classroom (experts who can demonstrate material and techniques effectively).

How can we follow up and assist classroom teachers in using:

Diagnostic and evaluative information
Materials and techniques
Present services available

Lines of communication must improve.

1. Planning verbal approach vs. application approach with Federal Office. There should be a direct relationship with agency in planning grants, etc. (Mutual planning approach).
2. In evaluating grant applications, there should be the involvement of a more diversified group. Applicant should receive specific feedback from evaluation.

Auxiliary Personnel: Although some members of the group expressed reservations in this area others felt that use of teaching aids or assistants was valuable. Some functions now carried out by teachers might well be handled by people with a lesser training. Some investigation seems appropriate within the different areas to see just what these people should or should not do.

Teacher Competencies: The group expressed a need to know more about what sort of person was required in special education. Romaine Mackie et al study was mentioned but the general feeling was that while there was dissatisfaction with many present newly trained teachers, we really do not know what we want anyway.

Reimbursement problems create a real difficulty in school districts. Laws are too rigid.

Time to pull down the barriers in Special Education to provide better services to handicapped children. "Barriers" cited were between -

The public schools system and parochial schools.
Between areas of handicap. There is a need for sharing of materials and methods.
Between special education and general education.
General Administrators need knowledge of Special Education. If not in their training, institutions and workshops can help fill the void.
Between residential facilities and public school programs.
There needs to be more coordination of activities.
Between school districts - there must be more combining school districts to provide better services.

Lack of creativity at all levels of education is recognized as a problem. Maybe because of our having passed through the system, we are not really able to take the sort of look at ourselves that will produce radical changes in approaches to our problems.

Why are public schools responsible for "all" children, regardless of disability, from conception to death, when this responsibility should be spread to other concerned public agencies.

A major problem evolves around who is responsible and why they are. A thorough study is necessary in the area of money availability, legislation, bureaucratic organization.

More cooperation between general ed and special ed (this must be instituted at the college or university level). All education must be aware of the philosophy of special ed. Question; should special ed classes be mandatory for students in teacher training.

More community services are necessary for purposes of promoting interaction within communities to get them involved with the exceptional child. Sensitivity training was deemed necessary before civic support of programs will really succeed.

More emphasis must be placed on prevention of disabilities rather than cure.

The entire area of services to the exceptional children need study as to legislation and articulation between various agencies providing services.

More awareness is needed of IMC's concerning, methods of gathering data, synthesizing data, and especially dissemination of information. Much work must be done on exchange of information between agencies.

Do "Levels of Expectation" negate or downgrade the possible achievement of handicapped children.

What role can the Bureau of Handicapped play in suggesting criteria or standards at all levels of services for the handicapped.

What is the most effective means of training teacher aides, institutional aides, and other para-professionals who will be working in special education?

Should some type of "grand-father" clause be considered in reviewing the classroom teaching experience of some college personnel to determine their merits to be a primary person in a training program? As it is now interpreted many of our current leaders in the field cannot qualify.

What can be done to "brighten" the image of special education?

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP

by
Dr. Darrell Holmes
April 26, 1968

I. <u>The growing importance of educational programs and services for handicapped children to society in general--particularly the relationship of special education to the social service concept which is developing in society; e.g.</u>

One of the most wasted resources of our nation today is the groups of several million handicapped children who stand poorly prepared to enter adulthood as productive citizens, but who will enter it nonetheless. Their horizons are meager. Their hopes have frequently turned in quiet retreat or noisy opposition. Our urban centers and rural areas have little to celebrate about and much to fear when they assess the future of many of their handicapped young citizens. The handicapped youth today stand out in greater clarity than ever before in our nation's history.

We do know a good deal about them, e.g.

A. While more than half a million children of school age in the Western states are "exceptional" enough to need special education, only about 260,000--less than half--are receiving special education services of any kind. . .

B. More than 21,000 specially trained teachers are needed to educate these children, but today the West employs less than 8,000 such teachers.

C. Less than half the special educators employed in the Western states today have completed full programs of preparation for teaching in their special field.

D. In almost every area of special education, the demand for trained personnel in each of the next five years can be expected to exceed the supply of specialists in these fields being produced by Western

college and university training programs, even though this demand will be far below the number of teachers needed to educate our exceptional children.

This knowledge leads us to the following conclusions:

A. The Western states and training institutions need to plan together for strong training programs for teachers of handicapped and gifted children, if they are to avoid a haphazard growth of training programs unrelated to the region's personnel needs, the number of students available for training, and financial resources upon which training programs can call.

B. More effective recruitment of students for teaching careers in special education is vitally necessary if Western training programs are to produce the specialists the region needs in this field.

C. The citizens of the Western states generally need to see more clearly

   1. that they have a responsibility for the education of those children who are so different from normal children mentally or physically that they require teachers specially trained to meet their needs.

   2. that the shaping of education to the special needs of these children is within our national tradition of using education to help each individual realize his abilities to the fullest extent.

   3. that an investment in the education of these "exceptional"

children can bring a sound return to the states' economies, by allowing them to grow up as productive citizens instead of life-long community burdens whose own tragic lives affect the lives of millions of other.

Thus the major challenge of today is to translate current knowledge into effective solutions to the individual plights of handicapped children and the communities they inhabit. One solution is to assist these youth through special education and rehabilitation to prepare themselves for and to find meaningful roles which may give them a stake in an otherwise hostile society.

Colleges and universities have a definite responsibility, as well as opportunity, in meeting this challenge. Although the university has been characterized as primarily devoted to pure research and abstract thought, inspection will reveal that throughout history the university has been at the cutting edge of society itself. It is in this spirit, e.g., that Colorado State College established its program of special education, and responded to the request of the Bureau of Handicapped Children to sponsor this two-day "think-tank" session. Perhaps the most obvious evidence of Colorado State College's support of the concept of translation of theory into practice through becoming involved with doing is our special education laboratory school which is housed on campus in college facilities and operationally financed by the Greeley School District.

II. Responsibility of Colleges and Universities for:

A. Training Teachers and Preparing Leadership Personnel

On October 31, 1963, President Kennedy signed Public Law 88-164. He cited the importance of expanded programs for research and service in mental health and in mental retardation, and stated:

"But no law providing facilities can be effective so long as there is a persistent and nationwide shortage of qualified personnel to instruct the handicapped. Title III of the

bill helps cure that deficiency. There are today about five million handicapped children in need of special education. Two hundred thousand teachers are needed, but there are only about 60,000 available. Under this legislation, steps will be taken to educate more teachers for the handicapped."

During the past 15 years efforts to educate handicapped children have often been frustrated because of the severe shortage of personnel. The American people want handicapped children educated to their highest level. They have persuaded State legislatures to subsidize classes in public schools and have insisted on expanded programs. Actually, there are four major obstacles that have retarded development of special education and have served as a basis for many of our problems.

1. classroom space and diagnostic facilities are lacking. Expanded enrollments in schools have taxed classroom space and school financing. Superintendents have a difficult time finding funds and classroom space needed for special education.
2. even when space is made available, superintendents are unable to obtain a sufficient number of qualified teachers to conduct the classes. We have already noted that we need a minimum of 200,000 teachers to man the classes for 5,000,000 handicapped children. We now have 50,000 to 60,000 such teachers.
3. although a number of colleges and universities have for some time attempted to prepare teachers, supervisors, college instructors, and research personnel with limited funds and facilities, for every professional person prepared, four are needed.
4. most of the 60,000 teachers in the field today have obtained train-

ing through short summer courses, extension courses, and workshops. Many teachers recruited for the special education classes were untrained or partially trained.

Responsibility for the training of the needed personnel must rest with our educators, but they may need a great deal of stimulation to make it clear what the community needs and wants. Universities are prepared to engage in the preparation of professional personnel and to actively support recruitment programs in these areas.

B. Supporting Realistic Research Efforts

The colleges and universities need to be prepared to continue to engage in pilot projects and experiments to discover what will and what will not work in special education. Colleges and universities need to be prepared to engage in careful, long-run research leading to a growth in our knowledge. Colleges and universities need to be prepared to engage in short-run evaluations or demonstrations indicating probablistic efficiencies or alternative schemes in special education.

However, we need be concerned with more than just the production of research; we must also ask ourselves "What is the state of the art today in the communication, dissemination and utilization of special education research information." Hubert H. Humphrey in 1962 said, "the tragedy is that the magnificent effort to discover knowledge is not accompanied by a similar thrust to make certain that the knowledge is effectively and promptly communicated."

Colleges and universities have this responsibility of reducing the lag between research advances in special education and their dissemination and utilization.

We also have the responsibility of attacking new areas of special education programming, e.g.

Exploration of special education services in sparsely populated areas offers a tremendous challenge to the research field. Despite rapid escalation in kind and number of educational research projects within the past few years, despite all we hear about creativity, imagination and bold thought, new and better approaches to old problems, and new answers to new questions, little recognition and practically no attention have been given to this research problem. There are practically no research and almost no guidelines relevant to the provision of special education programs for youth in geographic areas characterized by great space and few people.

Most of the current special education programs are designed to serve clusters of children with similar exceptionalities. Cities and metropolitan areas can and do provide separate programs for the hard of hearing, educable and trainable mentally retarded, blind, partially seeing, emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, and gifted. Translation of these urban area programs into similarly organized programs for use in less populous areas has not been successful. The results have been much less than adequate. The programs fall short of providing equal educational opportunities for the exceptional children who reside in sparsely populated areas.

III. <u>Importance of continued stimulation of special education programs through Federal Grants and support.</u>

At a time when tremendous demands are being made upon colleges and universities for every resource of the halls of academic building space, facilities and human resources are extremely limited. Thus, the general public will have to be sufficiently well-informed to provide the necessary support for these programs. These programs will, of course, cost money. Ultimately we're going to have to reach more people and make them understand how urgent it is to recruit and train

personnel. Support for such activities must be made politically attractive. We have to think about this concretely and realistically in terms of our own communities, agencies and state situations, so that we are not dealing in fantasy during this conference but are talking about the practical next steps toward meeting needs that are becoming increasingly urgent.

Federal support will continue to be necessary. Even here in the more sparsely populated areas of the nation, state institutions such as CSC are in fact training graduate level personnel for the entire United States, not just Colorado; therefore, Federal involvement is particularly appropriate.

IV. The importance of this and similar conferences:

The problem areas discussed and suggested solutions to these problems will be of real value in guiding both the Bureau of Handicapped Children and Youth and institutions of higher learning. This conference has provided a forum for persons from the relevent disciplines, from various geographical locations in the West, and from a broad range of agencies, to foster face-to-face communication and to encourage collaboration among these persons and agencies in regard to the continual problems in special education. The problem areas discussed and suggested solutions to these problems will be of real value in guiding both the Bureau of Handicapped Children and Youth and the various institutions of higher learning.

ROSTER OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

ARKANSAS

Mr. Charles E. Acuff	Superintendent, Arkansas Children's Colony Conway, Arkansas
Mr. Don Blessing	Assistant Director, Special Education Little Rock School District Little Rock, Arkansas
Dr. Sam Clements	Administrator, Little Rock Medical School Little Rock, Arkansas
Mr. Tom Hicks	State Director, Special Education Little Rock, Arkansas
Dr. Harold Love	Chairman, Dept. Special Education State College of Arkansas Conway, Arkansas
Dr. J. M. Sadnavitch	University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas
Dr. Ralph White	Chairman, Dept. Special Education Arkansas State University Jonesboro, Arkansas

COLORADO

Dr. William David	Chairman Special Education University of Denver Denver, Colorado
Mr. Miles Fairchild	Loretto Heights College Denver, Colorado
Dr. B. R. Gearheart	Associate Professor Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Mr. Milo P. Henkels	Assistant Professor Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Mr. H. Gene Hensley	W.I.C.H.E. Boulder, Colorado
Dr. Dale Lundeen	Professor of Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Mrs. Grace Napier	Assistant Professor of Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado

COLORADO (Cont'd)

Dr. Oliver P. Kolstoe	Professor of Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Dr. John Ogden	State Director, Special Education Denver, Colorado
Dr. Merle Ogle	Director of Higher Education Region VIII U. S. Office of Education Denver, Colorado
Dr. Dwayne Peterson	Assistant Professor Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Dr. William Reid	Director, RMSEIMC Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Mr. Floyd Rogers	Acting Director, Special Education Colorado Springs Public Schools Colorado Springs, Colorado
Mr. C. Edward Ronayne	Director, Special Education Poudre School District Fort Collins, Colorado
Mr. J. J. Runkel	Programs Officer, (Title I) Region VIII U. S. Office of Education Denver, Colorado
Claudette Stock	Kennedy Developmental Center Denver, Colorado
Dr. Ray Taibl	Director, Special Education Pueblo Public Schools Pueblo, Colorado
Dr. Iona E. Taylor	Director, Special Services Boulder Valley Public Schools Boulder, Colorado
Dr. Tony D. Vaughan	Chairman, Department Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Dr. Robert Weiland	Director, Special Services Jefferson County Public Schools Lakewood, Colorado
Dr. Robert W. Wertz	Speech & Hearing Clinic University of Colorado Denver, Colorado

COLORADO (Cont'd)

Mr. Earl West	Director, Home Life & Training State Home and Training Schools Grand Junction, Colorado
Mr. Ted White	Director, Special Education Denver Public Schools Denver, Colorado
Dr. Wesley White	Dept. of Institutions Denver. Colorado
Dr. Richard Wolfe	Assistant Professor Special Education Colorado State College Greeley, Colorado
Dr. David Yoder	Speech Pathology & Audiology Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado

KANSAS

Mr. Ted Gray	Director, Special Education Kansas City, Kansas
Dr. Robert Haines	Director, Institutional Management State Dept. of Social Welfare Topeka, Kansas
Dr. John V. Irwin	University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas
Dr. John King	Professor of Special Education Kansas State Teachers College Fort Hays, Kansas
Mr. Jim Marshall	State Director, Special Education Topeka, Kansas
Mrs. Adrian Miller	State NARC Officer Topeka, Kansas
Dr. Robert Ridgeway	Sp. Ed. IMC, University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas
Mrs. Clara Robertson	Consultant, Dept. of Public Instruction Topeka, Kansas
Dr. Richard Schiefelbusch	Director, Bureau of Child Research Kansas University Lawrence, Kansas

LOUISIANA

Dr. A. C. Blanks	Director, Special Education Center Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Dr. Tony Byles	Director, Special Education Center McNeese State College Lake Charles, Louisiana
Dr. M. J. Cousins	Director, Special Education Center Northwestern State College Natchitoches, Louisiana
Dr. Faye McCormick	State Director, Special Education Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Dr. John Robinson	Head, Dept. Special Education Southeastern Louisiana College Hammond, Louisiana
Dr. Alvin Stern	Director, Special Education Center Louisiana State University New Orleans, Louisiana

MISSOURI

Dr. Richard Blankenship	Director, Special Education Southeast Missouri State College Cape Girardeau, Missouri
Mr. Afton Bridges	Director, Special Education Springfield Public Schools Springfield, Missouri
Mr. Walter Conway	Director Educational Program Nevada State Hospital Nevada, Missouri
Mr. Don Cox	State Director, Special Education Jefferson City, Missouri
Dr. William Hall	Special Programs, Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri
Dr. William E. Johnson	Director Pupil Services No. Kansas City Public Schools Kansas City, Missouri
Dr. John Kidd	Asst. Supt., Special School District Rock Hill, Missouri
Dr. Richard Schofer	Special Education, University of Missouri Columbia, Missouri
Mr. B. W. Sheperd	Director, State Schools for Retarded Children, Jefferson City, Missouri

NEW MEXICO

Mrs. Marian Barefoot	Coordinator, Special Education Public Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Dr. Louis Bransford	Special Education, Univ. of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico
Mr. Roland Caster	Special Education, Las Cruces Public Schools, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Dr. Wanda Graham	Dept. of Special Education Eastern New Mexico University Portales, New Mexico
Mr. William Green	Executive Director New Mexico Assoc. for Retarded Children Albuquerque, New Mexico
Mr. Louis McDonald	Special Education, Roswell Public Schools Roswell, New Mexico
Dr. Robert Swanson	State Director, Special Education Santa Fe, New Mexico

OKLAHOMA

Mrs. Mary Bloomer	Consultant in Special Education Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Dr. Rondal Gamble	Director, Special Education Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma
Dr. Thayne Hedges	Chairman, Speech Pathology Phillips University Enid, Oklahoma
Mr. Herschel Melton	Director, Special Education Midwest City Public Schools Midwest City, Oklahoma
Dr. Edmond Nuttall	Director, Speech & Hearing University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma
Dr. J. L. Riddle	Director, Special Education Northeast State College Tahlequah, Oklahoma
Mr. Oscar V. Rose	Superintendent Midwest City Schools Midwest City, Oklahoma
Mr. Robert Sanders	Exec. Secy., State Assn. Retarded Children Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Mr. LeRoy Taylor	State Director, Special Education Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

TEXAS

Dr. Aaron Armfield	Chairman, Special Education East Texas State College Commerce, Texas
Dr. Natalie Barraga	Dept. of Special Education University of Texas Austin, Texas
Mr. John Best	Superintendent, Texas School for the Blind Austin, Texas
Mrs. Tommye Frye	Director, Special Services Pasadena Independent School District Pasadena, Texas
Peggy Harrison	Chairman, Dept. Speech Pathology & Aud. Southern Methodist College Callas, Texas
Miss Jo Kelly	Director, Special Education Ft. Worth Public Schools Ft. Worth, Texas
Dr. Bruce Mattson	Chairman, Special Education Texas Technological College Lubbock, Texas
Mr. Don L. Partridge	State Director, Special Education Austin, Texas
Mr. Vidal M. Trevino	Principal, Christian Junior High School Laredo, Texas
Mrs. Edwina Youngblood	President, Texas Assn. for Retarded Children, Austin, Texas

UTAH

Dr. Hilda Jones	Director, Special Education Granite School District Salt Lake City, Utah
Dr. Joseph Kessler	Medical Director, Univ. Affiliated Center Utah State University Logan, Utah
Dr. Kaye Owen	Chairman, Special Education Utah State University Logan, Utah
Dr. Burton Miller	Director Special Education Salt Lake City Public Schools Salt Lake City, Utah

UTAH (Cont'd)

Dr. Elwood Pace	State Director, Special Education Salt Lake City, Utah
Dr. Marguerite Wilson	Special Education, Brigham Young Univ. Provo, Utah

OBSERVERS

Dr. Rosanne Silberman	Columbia University New York, New York
Dr. Hester C. Burbridge	University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED
U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20202

Mary Ann Clark Assistant Education Specialist	Dr. Edwin Martin Deputy Associate Commissioner
Marge Fratkin Assistant Education Specialist	Dr. James Moss Director, Division of Research
Dr. James Gallagher Associate Commissioner	Mr. Lee Ross Director, Information & Reports Staff
Dr. John W. Jones Chief, Aid to States Branch	Dr. Frank Withrow Director, Div. of Educational Services
Dr. Leonard Lucito Director, Div. of Training Programs	Dr. Ken Wyatt Coordinator, State Plans & Administrators Unit